R E M A R K S

Applicants are still attempting to have the PCT Office send the priority document copy to the U.S. Patent Office in accordance with usual PCT procedures.

The Examiner rejected claims 51-70 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite. This problem has been avoided by striking the words "under control and" in the new patent claims.

The Examiner rejected previous claims 51-70 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over AAPA in view of Dexter.

New claim 71 clearly distinguishes for the following reasons. First, however, an explanation of new claim 71 is provided herewith to assist the Examiner's understanding.

The generated print data stream has a first object property associated with at least one region of the print pages. Applicants' Substitute Specification at page 9, lines 18-23 explain that there can be an object property in the print data stream such as graphic objects in a graphic format. This could, for example, be the first object property referred to.

Next, in claim 71 this print data stream with the first object property is rasterized using the first object property and is then displayed.

The operator then selects at least one part of the at least one region and associates at least one second object property differing from the first object property with the selected part of the at least one region. This is explained by Figure 12 of Applicants' specification and also at Substitute Specification page 9, beginning at line 8 down through line 18.

Thereafter rasterizing occurs in a second raster process dependent on both the first and second object properties. Thus, for example, the second rasterizing can

-6-

take into account both the first and the second object properties so that when the rasterized data is run on the printer, special techniques can be used for printing this second rasterized data in accordance with both properties.

Applicants' AAPA object properties are associated with individual objects of the print page upon generation of the print page, with aid of which object properties a selection of processing methods occurs for generation of a print image. But in the AAPA there is no first rasterizing by use of a first object property, displaying the rasterized print data of the first raster process, and then selecting at least one part of the at least one region and then associating at least one second object property differing from the first object property, and then processing the print data of the selected part of the at least one region in the second rasterizing process dependent on both the first and the second object properties. At page 4, the middle, the Examiner indicates that he agrees that AAPA does not teach the above features. The Examiner then cites Dexter Figure 5 and paragraphs 37 and 38 for the missing features.

Dexter paragraphs 37 and 38 talks about displaying a scanned image and defining at least one region on the displayed scan image. Then the print data is rasterized depending on the designated region or regions. But there is no first rasterizing by use of the first object property followed by a selection and associating a second object property differing from the first object property and then processing in a second raster process dependent on both the first and second object properties.

Dependent claims 72-79 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 71 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Independent claim 80 distinguishes in a manner similar to claim 71 by reciting the first and the second raster processes and the first and second object properties

but recites that the print data of the selected part of the at least one region is rasterized in the second raster process dependent on only the second object property. Again, neither AAPA nor Dexter talk about the two rasterizing processes with the first object property before the raster process, the second object property defined before the second raster process, and then rasterizing in the second raster process dependent on only the second object property.

Dependent claims 81-88 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 80.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,

_____ (Reg.No. 27,841)
Brett A. Valiquet
Schiff Hardin LLP
Patent Department
Suite 6600 233 S. Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 258-5786
Attorneys for Applicants.
CUSTOMER NO. 26574

CH2\8693931.1